

I object to Sinclair's obvious use of our public airways to further its own political agenda by showing an extremely biased and one-sided point of view. This is not "newsworthy with equal time given to the opposition. This is why I objected to such media conglomeration and monopolization in the first place. It never serves the broader public interest and is downright detrimental to our democracy. The media is becoming the cheerleader for the administration instead of the "fourth branch" of the government.

Sincerely,
kmc

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.